



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,789	10/23/2003	Jun-Kook Choi	SNJ-0048	7185
23413	7590	01/07/2008		
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP			EXAMINER	
20 Church Street			WANG, QUAN ZHEN	
22nd Floor				
Hartford, CT 06103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,789

Applicant(s)

CHOI ET AL.

Examiner

Quan-Zhen Wang

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. (DE 100 50 936 A1)

Regarding claim 6, Chung discloses a switching media converter (MC) (figs. 1 and 3, ONU) usable in a wavelength division multiplexing passive optical network (WDM PON) system using the same wavelength for forward and backward channels, comprising:

a master transmitting/receiving unit (fig. 1, element 210) for converting an electrical signal received from an optical network unit into an optical signal, and transmitting the optical signal to a coupler for a master channel, while converting an optical signal received from the coupler for the master channel into an electrical signal, and outputting the electrical signal to the optical network unit;

a slave transmitting/receiving unit (fig. 1, element 220) for converting an electrical signal received from an optical network unit into an optical signal, and transmitting the optical signal to a coupler for a slave channel, while converting an optical signal

received from the coupler for the slave channel into an electrical signal, and outputting the electrical signal to the optical network unit;

a control unit (fig. 1, control device 230) for detecting a line breakage (fig. 3, optical fiber breakage), and activating a selected one of the master and slave transmitting/receiving units to utilize a redundant channel such that optical transmission occurs not through the master channel (fig. 1, element 210) but through the slave channel (fig. 1, element 220); and

interfaces (fig. 1, MOD2 and DEM2) respectively connected to the master and slave transmitting/receiving units, each of the interfaces performing a data interfacing operation between an associated one of the master and slave transmitting/receiving units and the optical network unit (devices connected to interfaces MOD2 and DEM2, not shown in fig. 1).

Chung differs from the claimed invention in that Chung does not specifically disclose that the control unit performs a test in response to an error event to determine whether or not the error event is caused by a reflection. However, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function alone (see MPEP 2114). If a functional limitation can be performed by the prior art structure, a prima facie case is established (see *In re Swinehart*, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971); *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997)). For the instant case, Chung discloses to detecting a line breakage, and the control unit of Chung is capable to detect a reflection from a line breakage. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to configure the

control unit to perform a test in response to an error event to determine whether or not the error is caused by a reflection. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly detect a fiber breakage and restore operability (abstract).

Regarding claim 8, Chung further discloses that the control unit disables a transmitter included in the transmitting/receiving unit associated with the currently-activated channel, and detects whether or not a receiver included in the associated transmitting/receiving unit can be switched to a link-on state, thereby determining whether or not a fiber breakage status occurs (fig. 3, optical fiber breakage).

3. Claims 1-5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. (DE 100 50 936 A1) in view of Van Deventer (U.S. Patent US 5,886,801).

Regarding claim 1, Chung discloses a ring type wavelength division multiplexing passive optical network (WDM PON) system (figs. 1-3) using the same wavelength for forward and backward channels, comprising: a central office (figs. 1 and 3, CBS) including general media converters (MCs) each having a transmitter adapted to convert an electrical signal into an optical signal to be outputted, and a receiver adapted to receive an optical signal having the same wavelength as the output optical signal, and to convert the received optical signal into an electrical signal to be outputted, and a WDM multiplexer/demultiplexer (MUX/DEMUX) (figs. 1 and 3, WDM) for multiplexing

optical signals of different wavelengths respectively outputted from the general MCs, and externally outputting the resultant multiplexed optical signal, the WDM MUX/DEMUX also demultiplexing a multiplexed signal, externally inputted thereto, and outputting the resultant demultiplexed signals to respective general MCs; the optical communication lines constructing a ring type distribution network through bi-directional add/drop devices each coupled to the optical communication lines; and remote nodes (fig. 1 and 3, ONU's) including redundancy MCs respectively coupled to the bi-directional add/drop devices, each of the redundancy MCs functioning to detect a line breakage by checking whether an erroneous event corresponds to a link error (fig. 3, fiber breakage) or a system error, and to transmit an optical signal only in a clockwise or counter-clockwise direction in accordance with the result of the detection; wherein the redundancy MCs each include first and second couplers (fig. 1, the WDM in 210 and 220, respectively) respectively connected to a master channel and a slave channel of the redundancy MCs.

Chung differs from the claimed invention in that Chung does not specifically disclose that, in response to an error event occurring, each of the redundancy MC's is capable of performing a test to determine whether or not the error event is caused by a reflection and, when the error event is caused by a reflection, a redundancy MC of the redundancy MC's initiates a utilization of a redundant channel such that optical transmission occurs not through the master channel but through the slave channel. However, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function alone (see MPEP 2114). If a functional limitation

can be performed by the prior art structure, a prima facie case is established (see *In re Swinehart*, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971); *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997)). For the instant case, Chung discloses to detecting a line breakage, and the control unit of Chung is capable to detect a reflection from a line breakage. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to configure the MCs to perform a test in response to an error event to determine whether or not the error is caused by a reflection. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly detect a fiber breakage and restore operability (abstract).

Chung further differs from the claimed invention in that Chung does not specifically disclose a coupler for transmitting the multiplexed signal outputted from the WDM MUX/DEMUX through two different optical communication lines in a distributed manner, while transmitting an optical signal received from any one of the optical communication lines to the WDM MUX/DEMUX. However, it is well known in the art to use a coupler for transmitting signals through two different optical communication lines in a distributed manner. For example, Van Deventer discloses using a coupler (fig. 1, power splitter 2) for transmitting signals through two different optical communication lines in a distributed manner. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to incorporate a coupler for transmitting signals through two different optical communication lines in a distributed manner, as it is disclosed by Van Deventer, in the system of Chung in order to simplify the equipment configuration of central office.

4. Claims 7 and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. (DE 100 50 936 A1) in view of Kowalczyk et al. (U.S. Patent US 5,87,957).

Regarding claim 7, Chung differs from the claimed invention in that Chung does not specifically disclose a buffer arranged at a rear end of the interface connected to the slave transmitting/receiving unit, and adapted to perform a data buffering operation. However, it is well known in the art to include a buffer in a slave transmitting/receiving unit. For example, Kowalczyk discloses a buffer arranged in a slave transmitting/receiving unit, and adapted to perform a data buffering operation (fig. 3, column 3, line 36 to column 4, line 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to incorporate a buffer in the slave transmitting/receiving unit and adapted to perform a data buffering operation, as it is disclosed by Kowalczyk, in the system of Chung in order to prevent data loss in the communication system.

Regarding claim 10, Chung further discloses that the control unit disables a transmitter included in the transmitting/receiving unit associated with the currently-activated channel, and detects whether or not a receiver included in the associated transmitting/receiving unit can be switched to a link-on state, thereby determining whether or not a fiber breakage status occurs (fig. 3).

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. (DE 100 50 936 A1) in view of Van Deventer (U.S. Patent US 5,886,801) and further

in view of Oberg et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2005/0084262 A1) (Oberg 1).

Regarding claim 2, Chung and Van Deventer have been discussed above in regard with claim 1. The modified system of Chung and Van Deventer differs from the claimed invention in that Chung and Van Deventer do not specifically disclose that the system comprises at least one of the remote nodes further includes a 3-port add/drop device coupled to the optical communication lines constructing the ring type distribution network. However, it is well known in that to include a 3-port add/drop device coupled to the optical communication lines constructing the ring type distribution network. For example, Oberg 1 discloses that a system comprises at least one of the remote nodes including a 3-port add/drop device coupled to the optical communication lines constructing the ring type distribution network (fig. 9b, node C). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to incorporate a 3-port add/drop device, as it is disclosed by Oberg 1, for a node in the system of Chung in order to simplify the equipment configuration of the node.

6. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. (DE 100 50 936 A1) in view of Van Deventer (U.S. Patent US 5,886,801) and further in view of Oberg et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2003/0128984 A1) (Oberg 2).

Regarding claim 3, Chung and Van Deventer have been discussed above in regard with claim 1. The modified system of Chung and Van Deventer differs from the

claimed invention in that Chung and Van Deventer do not specifically disclose that the WDM filters are thin film WDM filters. However, it is well known in the art to use thin film filters for add/drop WDM filters. For example, Oberg 2 discloses using thin film filters for add/drop WDM filters (fig. 6a, paragraph 0040). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to use thin film filters for the add/drop WDM filters, as it is disclosed by Oberg 2, in the modified system of Chung and Van Deventer in order to separate the add/drop optical signals from the transmission line using the well developed filtering method.

Regarding claim 4, Chung further discloses a master transmitting/receiving unit (fig. 1, element 210 in ONU) and a slave master transmitting/receiving unit (fig. 1, element 220 in ONU); a control unit (fig. 1, control device 230) for detecting respective states of the master and slave transmitting/receiving units and a fiber breakage status (fig. 3, optical fiber breakage), thereby activating a selected one of the master and slave transmitting/receiving units to perform transmitting and receiving operations; and interfaces (fig. 1, MOD2 and DEM2) respectively connected to the master and slave transmitting/receiving units, each of the interfaces performing a data interfacing operation between an associated one of the master and slave transmitting/receiving units and the optical network unit.

Regarding claim 5, Chung further discloses that the control unit disables a transmitter included in the transmitting/receiving unit associated with the currently-activated channel, and detects whether or not a receiver included in the associated

transmitting/receiving trait can be switched to a link-on state, thereby determining whether or not a fiber breakage status occurs (fig. 3, optical fiber breakage).

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. (DE 100 50 936 A1) in view of Van Deventer (U.S. Patent US 5,886,801) and Oberg et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2005/0084262 A1) (Oberg 1), and further in view of Oberg et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2003/0128984 A1) (Oberg 2).

Regarding claim 9, Chung, Van Deventer, and Oberg 1 have been discussed above in regard with claim 2. The modified system of Chung, Van Deventer, and Oberg 1 differs from the claimed invention in that Chung, Van Deventer, and Oberg 1 do not specifically disclose that the WDM filters are thin film WDM filters. However, it is well known in the art to use thin film filters for add/drop WDM filters. For example, Oberg 2 discloses using thin film filters for add/drop WDM filters (fig. 6a, paragraph 0040). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to use thin film filters for the add/drop WDM filters, as it is disclosed by Oberg 2, in the modified system of Chung, Van Deventer, and Oberg 1 in order to separate the add/drop optical signals from the transmission line using the well developed filtering method.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6 and 8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Applicant's other arguments filed on October 23, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejections under 35 USC 103(a) of claim 1, Applicant argues that the combination of Chung and Van Deventer does not disclose that, "in response to an error event occurring, each of the redundancy MC's is capable of performing a test to determine whether or not the error event is caused by a reflection and, when the error event is caused by a reflection, a redundancy MC of the redundancy MC's initiates a utilization of a redundant channel such that optical transmission occurs not through the master channel but through the slave channel". However, in accordance with MPEP, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function alone (see MPEP 2114). If a functional limitation can be performed by the prior art structure, a prima facie case is established (see *In re Swinehart*, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971); *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997)). For the instant case, Chung discloses that each MC functioning to detect a line breakage (fig. 3), and the claims do not differentiate MC from the MC of Chung. Therefore, the MC of Chung is considered being capable to detect a reflection from a line breakage. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time when the invention was made to configure the MCs to perform a test in response to an error event to determine whether or not the error is caused by a

reflection. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly detect a fiber breakage and restore operability (abstract). Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 still stands.

For the same reasons, the rejections of claims 2-5, 7, and 9-10 still stand.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Koonen (U.S. Patent US 6,681,083 B1) discloses a power splitter for optical network.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quan-Zhen Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3114. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

qzw
1/3/2008


JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600